

REMARKS

This amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 2, 2004, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-19 are now all the claims pending in the present application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 8-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner asserts that claims 1 and 8-11 lack sufficient structure to performed the claimed function. Applicant has amended claim 1 as indicated above. Consequently, the rejection of claims 1 and 8-11 under § 112 should be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shibuta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,512,867). Claims 1 and 18 have been amended as indicated above.

The Examiner cites stainless steel container 3 and epoxy based adhesive 4 for teaching the cover and cover member, respectively, of claim 1. However, there is no indication that stainless steel container 3 is “molded around an electromagnetic device body with molding

pressure” as recited in claim 1. In particular, bobbin 1 is placed inside stainless container 3 and epoxy based adhesive 4 is injected between the stainless steel container 3 and bobbin 1 in order to act as a filler. See Shibuta col. 2, lines 40-44. Therefore, Shibuta does not disclose “a cover molded around an electromagnetic device body with molding pressure.”

Moreover, epoxy based adhesive 4 does not “protect said coil from molding pressure when said cover member is molded around a cover member.” More particularly, there is no indication of molding pressure in the Shibuta reference. At most, there may be trivial pressure during the filling of the epoxy based adhesive, however, the filling of an epoxy based adhesive in a container does not teach the claimed molding pressure as would be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art. In any case, the epoxy 4 could not be both the source of the pressure and the protection from the pressure, although the Examiner seems to suggest this.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed patentable. Since claim 18 recites similar elements, it should be deemed patentable for the same reasons.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shibuta in view of Ghorashi

Claims 7-11 and 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibuta in view of Ghorashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,202,187).

Claims 7 and 14 have been canceled from the present application. Consequently, the Examiner’s rejection of claims 7 and 14 is now moot.

Claim 17

Claim 17 recites that “said cover member is cylindrical in shape.” In response to Applicant’s previously submitted argument that epoxy based adhesive 4 (cover member as cited by the Examiner), is not cylindrical in shape, the Examiner asserts that cover 3 (stainless container) and not epoxy based adhesive 4, is being cited for teaching a cylindrical cover. However, in rejecting claim 1, stainless container 3 was cited for teaching a cover and epoxy based adhesive 4 was cited by the Examiner for teaching a cover member. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify this inconsistency.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shibuta in view of Trunzo

Claims 7, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibuta et al. in view of Trunzo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,676,814).

Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 7. Claim 7 has been canceled.

The Examiner asserts that Trunzo teaches a coating for a coil wire composed of a welding layer that is made of thermoset epoxy and an insulative layer that is made of enamel, as recited in claim 12. However, the Examiner has provided no explanation as to why these aspects of Trunzo would be combined with Shibuta. There would be no reason to combine the aspects of Trunzo with Shibuta and the Examiner’s reasoning appears to merely be a result of

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No.: 09/961,273

Attorney Docket No.: Q65705

impermissible hindsight. Since the "wire" in Shibuta is a superconducting ceramic, coatings such as that claimed would be likely impossible due to thermal effects.

Moreover, there is no indication of a welding layer that is made of thermoset epoxy. For at least these reasons, claim 12 and dependent claim 13 should be deemed patentable.


V. New Claim

Applicant has added claim 19 to provide a more varied scope of protection.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 1, 2004